

March 25, 2004

INITIAL STUDY FORM

1. Project Number(s)/Environmental Log Number/Title:

ZAP 03-034/ER #03-02-016/#20104 A Del Rio AT&T

2. Description of Project:

The project proposes the installation, operation, and maintenance of an unmanned telecommunications facility. The project consists of a concrete mounting pad for an Argus TE12 Outdoor Cabinet power supply system and three Nokia Ultrasite Cabinets. A 35-foot high mono-pine will be adjacent to the equipment cabinets to support the directional cellular antennas and related cellular telecommunications equipment. The planned AT&T equipment location is immediately northwest of the on-site detached shed/garage, an open-air covered space. The AT&T equipment area will have a three-sided, 8-foot high CMY retaining wall on the north, south, and west sides. The enclosure shall have 8-foot tall block walls on north, south, and west sides and 6-foot tall block wall on the east side. In addition, a 4-foot wide wood gate entrance will be located on the east side. The project will be serviced by the Rainbow Municipal Water District and the North County Fire Protection District of SD County. Access to the site can be obtained from S. Mission Road.

3. Project Sponsor's Name and Address:

Richard and Debra Gleason
4571 S. Mission Road
Fallbrook, CA 92028

4. Project Location:

The project site is located on the west side of S. Mission Road between La Canada Road and Baja Mission Road. The street address is 4571 S. Mission Road in the Fallbrook Community Planning Area, a community in the unincorporated areas of the San Diego County. APN is 123-330-12.

Thomas Brothers Coordinates: Page 1047, Grid J/5

5. Surrounding Land Uses and Environmental Setting:

The existing land uses surrounding the project site are single-family residences in all directions. South Mission Road is directly to the east of the project site. No native vegetation will be impacted by the proposed project.

6. General Plan Designation

Community Plan:	Fallbrook
Land Use Designation:	17 – Estate Residential
Density:	1 du/2.4 acre(s)

7. Zoning

Use Regulation:	A70 – Limited Agriculture
Density:	.25 du/1 acre(s)
Special Area Regulation:	--

8. Environmental resources either significantly affected or significantly affected but avoidable as detailed on the following attached "Environmental Analysis Form".

Noise

9. Lead Agency Name and Address:

County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B MS O650
San Diego, California 92123-1666

10. Lead Agency Contact and Phone Number:

Luis Fernandez
(858) 495-5393

11. Anticipated discretionary actions and the public agencies whose discretionary approval is necessary to implement the proposed:

Permit Type/Action

Agency

Minor Use Permit

County of San Diego

12. State agencies (not included in #11) that have jurisdiction by law over natural resources affected by the project:

None

13. Participants in the preparation of this Initial Study:

Luis Fernandez, Environmental Analyst, DPLU
Karen Howard, Planner, DPLU
Nael Areigat, Project Manager, DPW
Paula Barca, Civil Engineer, DPW
John Bennett, Noise Specialist, DPLU

14. Initial Study Determination:

On the basis of this Initial Study, the Department of Planning and Land Use believes that the proposed project may have a potentially significant effect on the environment. However, the mitigation measures described in the attached Environmental Analysis Form have been added to the project which clearly reduce the potentially significant effects to a level below significance. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

LUIS FERNANDEZ, Environmental Analyst
County of San Diego, Department of Planning and Land Use
Resource Planning

Date: March 25, 2004

ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS FORM

DATE: March 25, 2004

PROJECT NAME: #20104 A Del Rio/ AT&T

PROJECT NUMBER(S): ZAP 03-034/ER #03-02-016

EXPLANATION OF ANSWERS:

The following questions are answered either "Potentially Significant Impact", "Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated", "Less Than Significant Impact", or "Not Applicable" and are defined as follows.

"Potentially Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project has a potentially significant environmental effect and the effect is not clearly avoidable with mitigation measures or feasible project changes.

"Potentially Significant Impact" means that County staff recommends the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the project.

"Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated." County staff is of the opinion there is substantial evidence that the project may have a potentially significant adverse effect on the resource. However, the incorporation of mitigation measures or project changes agreed to by the applicant has clearly reduced the effect to a less than significant level.

"Less Than Significant Impact." County staff is of the opinion that the project may have an effect on the resource, but there is no substantial evidence that the effect is potentially significant and/or adverse.

"Not Applicable." County staff is of the opinion that, as a result of the nature of the project or the existing environment, there is no potential for the proposed project to have an effect on the resource.

I. LAND USE AND PLANNING

1. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with any element of the General Plan including community plans, land use designation, or zoning?

Less Than Significant Impact

Proposal

The proposal is a Minor Use Permit to construct a 35 foot tall Mono Pine Wireless Communication Facility with two (2) sectors and four (4)

antennas on a 6.45 acre site. In addition, two equipment cabinets (4 feet 6 inches wide x 2 feet 6 inches long and 2 feet 6 inches wide x 2 feet 6 inches long) will be mounted to a 7 foot wide x 18 foot long concrete pad. The enclosure shall have 8-foot tall block walls on north, south, and west sides and 6-foot tall block wall on the east side. In addition, a 4-foot wide wood gate entrance will be located on the east side.

Property Description

The tree is proposed in the northwest quadrant on a generally level area. South Mission Road (SR 13) and a creek are located about 500 feet to the east. Land uses on the property include residential uses, and a boarding and training facility for horses. The property contains trees, shrubs and grasses. Adjacent land uses include a vegetated hillside to the north, S. Mission Road to the east, residential to the west and south.

General Plan

The San Diego County General Plan designates the site as (17) Estate Residential. The site is located in the Estate Development Area (EDA). A Minor Impact Utility is an allowable use under these designations. The Fallbrook Community Plan implements the land use designations contained in the General Plan. The project is consistent with the following Fallbrook Community Plan Policies on page 4:

G. Public Utilities and Community Facilities

- Provide adequate and equitable financed public services and facilities.

It is also consistent with the Public Safety Element Policy 4 on Page VII-27:

- The County of San Diego will encourage and support the establishment and continual improvement of a County-wide emergency telephone communications system (911) in order that there be a minimal time lag between the occurrence of an incident and the dispatching of emergency units.

Zoning

The property is zoned A70, Limited Agricultural Use which permits Wireless Communication Facilities with an approved Minor Use Permit under the Minor Impact Utilities use type pursuant to Section 2184b of the Zoning Ordinance.

2. Would the proposal potentially be in conflict with applicable environmental plans or policies adopted by agencies with jurisdiction over the project?

Less Than Significant Impact

In the review of the project, no conflicts with environmental plans or policies adopted by other agencies have been identified. These agencies include, but are not limited to: the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, the San Diego Air Pollution Control District, California Department of Fish and Game, the Federal Department of Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department of Health Services, and the County Department of Environmental Health.

3. Does the proposal have the potential to be incompatible with existing or planned land uses or the character of the community?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposal is to construct a 35 foot tall Mono Pine Tree Wireless Communication Facility with two (2) antennas. Two equipment cabinets (4 feet 6 inches wide x 2 feet 6 inches long and 2 feet 6 inches wide x 2 feet 6 inches long) will be mounted to a 7 foot wide x 18 foot long concrete pad. The enclosure shall have 8-foot tall block walls on north, south, and west sides and 6-foot tall block wall on the east side. In addition, a 4-foot wide wood gate entrance will be located on the east side. Land uses on the property include residential uses and a boarding and training facility for horses,. The property is vegetated with very tall trees, shrubs and grasses. Adjacent land uses include a steep hillside to the north, South Mission Road to the east, residential to the west and south. The Mono Pine will be located in the northwest quadrant of the site between a carport and tall tree. It will not be visible from surrounding viewpoints. The project will not disrupt the surrounding land uses, thereby maintaining the existing character. Therefore the proposal will not have a harmful effect on neighborhood character or planned land use because the existing or planned land uses will not be negatively impacted.

4. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project is a telecommunication facility which does not propose major roadways, physical barriers or other features that would have the potential to significantly disrupt or divide the established community.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

1. Would the proposal convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance, as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use; or have a potentially adverse effect on prime agricultural soils as identified on the soils map for the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project site contains prime agricultural soils. However, the project site does not currently support any agricultural operations. The project site encompasses a relatively small area of land, 6.94 acres, and is surrounded by development similar to the proposed project. Therefore, this project would result not result in significant conversion of farmland resources to non-agricultural use.

2. Would the proposal conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. In addition, the project and surrounding area are not zoned for agricultural use, nor is the land under a Williamson Act Contract. Therefore, the project does not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act Contract.

3. Would the proposal involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to a non-agricultural use?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project site and surrounding area do not contain agriculture. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use.

III. POPULATION AND HOUSING

1. Would the proposal potentially induce substantial growth either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project does not involve substantial extensions of utilities such as water, sewer or new roads systems into previously unserved areas and is consistent with the County General Plan. The project will not induce substantial growth not consistent with County planning goals.

2. Would the proposal displace a potentially significant amount of existing housing, especially affordable housing?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project will not displace the existing residential uses.

IV. GEOLOGIC ISSUES

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to hazards related to fault rupture (Alquist-Priolo Zone), seismic ground shaking, seismic ground failure (liquefaction), rockfall, or landslides?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project is not located in a hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1994, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California. Also, a site visit conducted by Luis Fernandez on April 30, 2003, did not identify any features that would indicate landslides or the potential for liquefaction.

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant increased erosion or loss of topsoil?

Less Than Significant Impact

According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Visalia sandy loam (VaB), Cienega Coarse sandy loam (CIG2), and Placentia sandy loam (PeD2). The project will not result in

unprotected erodible soils; will not alter existing drainage patterns; is not located in a floodplain, wetland, or significant drainage feature; and will not develop steep slopes. The project is required to comply with the Sections 87.414 (DRAINAGE - EROSION PREVENTION) and 87.417 (PLANTING) of Division 7, EXCAVATION AND GRADING, of the San Diego County Zoning and Land Use Regulations. Due to these factors, it has been found that the project will not result in significantly increased erosion potential.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant unstable soil conditions (expansive soils) from excavation, grading, or fill?

Less Than Significant Impact

A review of the Soil Survey, San Diego Area CA by the U.S. Department of Agriculture has identified the following on-site soils having a HIGH shrink-swell behavior: Placentia sandy loam (PeD2). All other mapped soils on the site have a low to moderate shrink-swell behavior and are identified as stable with no adverse potential for development activity. However, potential impacts as a result of development in the areas with Placentia sandy loam (PeD2) will be avoided by compliance with the following measures and/or conditions in the Grading Ordinance Requirements Sections 87.403 and 87.410 specified at the time of the grading permit issuance. A soils report with compaction test is required for all fill that is over 12 inches in depth. DPL Form #73, Certification of Fill Compaction Report, completed by a registered engineer is to be submitted after the grading has been done.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant adverse effect to unique geologic features?

Less Than Significant Impact

On a site visit completed by Luis Fernandez on April 30, 2003 no significant geological features were identified on-site. No known unique geologic features were identified on the property or in the immediate vicinity on the Natural Resources Inventory of San Diego County listed in the Conservation Element of the San Diego County General Plan. Since no unique geologic features are present on the site, no adverse impacts will result from the proposed project.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant loss of availability of a significant mineral resource that would be of future value to the region?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will not result in a loss of availability of a known significant mineral resource that would be of value to the region. The project is not located in a significant mineral resource area, as identified on maps prepared by the Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology (Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego Production-Consumption Region, 1996). Also, on a site visit conducted by Luis Fernandez on April 30, 2003 no past or present mining activities were identified on the project.

V. WATER RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal violate any waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project does not propose waste discharges that require waste discharge requirement permits, NPDES permits, or water quality certification from the San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board (SDRWQCB).

2. Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project lies in the Bonsall hydrologic subarea, within the San Luis Rey hydrologic unit - that is impaired for Coliform bacteria and nutrients.

However, the project does not propose any known sources of pollutants, or land use activities that might contribute these pollutants.

3. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant increase in the demand on the local imported water system?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

4. Does the project comply with the County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO)?

Yes

The document is substantially complete and complies with the WPO requirements for a Minor Stormwater Management Plan.

5. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site. The proposed project consists of installing telecommunication antenna and equipment in an open area and will not alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on-site or off-site.

6. Would the proposed project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project does not involve construction of new or expanded development that could alter the drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site. The proposed project consists of installing telecommunication antenna and equipment in an open area and will not alter the existing natural topography, vegetation, or drainage courses on-site or off-site.

7. Would the proposed project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

Less Than Significant Impact

There are no planned storm water drainage systems proposed by the project, nor does the project require such systems.

8. Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project does not propose any known sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite.

9. Would the proposal provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project does not propose any known additional sources of polluted runoff. In addition the project does not propose new storm water drainage facilities, nor does the project site contain natural drainage features that would transport runoff offsite.

10. If the proposal is groundwater dependent, plans to utilize groundwater for non-potable purposes, or will obtain water from a groundwater dependent water district, does the project have a potentially significant adverse effect on groundwater quantity?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

11. Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported

sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

12. Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?

Not Applicable

The project will obtain its water supply from the Rainbow Municipal Water District, which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

VI. AIR QUALITY

1. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly contribute to the violation of any air quality standard or significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant Impact

No significant source of either stationary or indirect air pollutants has been identified from the project. The primary source of air pollutants would be generated from vehicle trips associated with the proposed project. The vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 1 monthly trip. According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the threshold of significance for reactive organic gases (ROG). Therefore, the vehicle trip emissions associated with the proposed project are not expected to significantly contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation. No other potential sources of air pollutants have been identified from the project. Additionally, the project is not expected to emit any toxic air contaminant or particulate matter based on project description and information submitted.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the exposure of people to any excessive levels of air pollutants?

Less Than Significant Impact

Based on a site visit conducted on April 30, 2003 by Luis Fernandez, the project is not located near any identified source of noxious emissions and will not expose people to excessive levels of air pollutants.

3. Would the proposal potentially result in the emission of objectionable odors at a significant intensity over a significant area?

Less Than Significant Impact

No potential sources of objectionable odors have been identified within the proposed project. Thus, the project is not expected to generate any significant levels of objectionable odors.

VII. TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION

1. Would the proposal result in a potential degradation of the level of service of affected roadways in relation to the existing traffic volumes and road capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed site will accommodate a telecommunication antenna and related equipment. The proposed project would not result in a degradation of the Level of Service (LOS) of affected roadways. The traffic volume from the project is approximately 1-trip per month for maintenance/inspection. Road capacity will not be impacted. Access to the proposed project is from South Mission Road (nearest public roads).

2. Would the proposal result in potentially significant impacts to traffic safety (e.g., limited sight distance, curve radii, right-of-way)?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will not have any potential impacts to traffic safety. A private engineer will certify that the project does not have any significant impacts on traffic safety, adequate sight distance has been provided at the access driveways prior to final occupancy (see condition B.1 in the DPW Preliminary Draft Requirements letter) and that all driveways are built to County and Fire Protection District standards (see condition A.1 in the DPW Preliminary Draft Requirements letter).

3. Would the proposal potentially result in insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposal is a telecommunications facility that will be serviced once a month by maintenance personnel. There is sufficient parking on-site.

Accordingly, parking will not result in an insufficient capacity on-site or off-site.

4. Would the proposal result in a potentially significant hazard or barrier for pedestrians or bicyclists?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will not have any significant increase in the volume of traffic on South Mission Road or any other County roads in the area. The project does not propose any hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists, nor will it affect existing conditions on South Mission Road or any other County road in the area for pedestrians or bicyclists. Any required improvements will be constructed to maintain or improve existing conditions as they relate to pedestrians and bicyclists.

VIII. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects, including noise from construction or the project, to an endangered, threatened, or rare plant or animal species or their habitats?

Less Than Significant Impact

The site contains no native vegetation or habitats. Therefore, no endangered, threatened or rare plant or animal species protected by the County of San Diego or State and Federal wildlife agencies are expected to occur on-site.

2. Does the project comply with the Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Article IV, Item 6) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable

The Resource Protection Ordinance is not applicable to this project.

3. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wetland habitats or wetland buffers? Is the project in conformance with wetland and wetland buffer regulations within the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Less Than Significant Impact

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year.

4. Does the proposed project have the potential to discharge material into and/or divert or obstruct the natural flow or substantially change the bed, channel or bank of any river, stream, lake, wetland or water of the U.S. in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or waters of the U.S that could potentially be impacted, diverted or obstructed by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands, rivers, streams, lakes or water of the U.S in which the California Department of Fish and Game and/or Army Corps of Engineers maintain jurisdiction over.

5. Would the proposal result in potentially significant adverse effects to wildlife dispersal corridors?

Less Than Significant Impact

No linear features (drainages, ridges, valley or linear-shaped patches of native vegetation) that connect areas of native vegetation or natural open space were identified on the site within the site visit conducted by Luis Fernandez on April 30, 2003. Therefore, the site is not expected to be used as a wildlife dispersal corridor and will not impact the dispersal of wildlife.

6. Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?

Not Applicable

The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.

7. Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?

Not Applicable

While the proposed project and off-site improvements are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program, the project site and locations of any off-site improvements do not contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.

IX. HAZARDS

1. Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project is not located on a site listed in the State of California Hazardous Waste and Substances sites list compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. In addition, an internal review of existing data and a field visit to the project site did not indicate the presence of any historic burnsites, landfills, or uses that may have contributed to potential site contamination. Therefore, no significant hazard to the public or the environment is expected to occur due to project implementation.

2. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly interfere with the County of San Diego Operational Area Emergency Plan or the County of San Diego Operational Site Specific Dam Failure Evacuation Data Plans?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project lies outside any mapped dam inundation area for major dams/reservoirs within San Diego County, as identified on inundation maps prepared by the dam owners.

3. Would the proposal have the potential to significantly increase the fire hazard in areas with flammable vegetation?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will not significantly increase the fire hazard because it will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Uniform Fire Code, Article 9 and Appendix II-A, Section 16, as adopted and amended by the local fire protection district. Implementation of these fire safety standards will occur during the building permit process.

4. a. Would the proposal expose people or property to flooding?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project consists of installing telecommunication antenna and equipment in an open area. The project will not expose people or property to flooding because it does not propose to significantly increase the impervious areas. The project does not have significant flood hazards or siltation problem from any sources.

- b. Does the project comply with the Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Article IV, Section 3) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it located near any watercourse, which is plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map.

5. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

6. Will the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it has neither a commercial nor industrial use and does not propose the storage, use, transport, disposal, or handling of Hazardous Substances.

7. Is the project within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school that will emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste in a quantity equal to or greater than that specified in subdivision (a) of Section 25536 of the Health and safety Code? Or, does the project involve the proposal of a school that is within one-quarter mile of a facility that exhibits the above characteristics?

Less Than Significant Impact

Although the project is located within one-quarter mile of an existing school, the project is not intended for commercial or industrial use and does not propose the handling, storage, or transport of hazardous materials.

8. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project is not located within any airport's Comprehensive Land Use Plan, nor is it located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport that has not adopted a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

9. For project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

The proposed project is not located within the vicinity (1 mile) of a private airstrip. Therefore the project will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

X. NOISE

1. Would the proposal result in exposing people to potentially significant noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Potentially Significant Unless Mitigation Incorporated

The applicant must address the following conditions of approval:

- a. Specify three Nokia Ultrasite outdoor equipment cabinets on the final site plans or equivalently sized cabinets each with a maximum one-hour sound pressure level of 60.5 decibels (dBA) at five feet or less. The Ultrasite cabinet has an acoustic height of 3 feet and is the model tested by Eilar Associates in August of 2003 as noted in the Noise Impact Analysis (#A30842) dated December 18, 2003.
- b. Specify on the final Site Plans one Argus outdoor power supply cabinet (model TE12) or an equivalently sized cabinet with a maximum one-hour sound pressure level of 74.5 decibels at five feet or less. The Argus TE12 cabinet has an acoustic height of 3 feet and is the model tested by Eilar Associates in August of 2003 as noted in the Noise Impact Analysis (#A30842) dated December 18, 2003.
- c. Specify on the "Equipment Plan" of the finalized site plans the equipment enclosure as a "noise control element". The enclosure's minimum top of barrier elevation on the north, south, and west sides is 250 feet AMSL (8-foot height). The enclosure design shall specify that the outside façade of each cabinet to be no more than 5 feet from the nearest interior wall surface. To specify an effective noise control element, the enclosure shall be described as "solid and be constructed of masonry, wood, plastic, fiberglass, steel, or a combination of these materials, with no cracks or gaps through or below the wall. The minimum surface density for the enclosure is 3.5 pounds per square foot. Any seams or cracks in the interior of the enclosure shall be filled or caulked. If wood is used, specify the design as tongue and groove with a minimum thickness of 7/8 of an inch. Any gate/door shall be designed with overlapping closures on the bottom and sides meet the minimum specifications of the wall materials described above. The gate may consist of 3/4-inch or thicker wood, a solid-sheet metal door with at least 18-gauge thickness, or an exterior-grade solid-core steel door with prefabricated door jambs."

- d. Prior to occupancy, submit to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Land Use for inclusion in the environmental file 03-02-016, digital photos demonstrating that the specified cabinets have been installed including their serial numbers or identification plates for each of the four ground-mounted equipment cabinets at the completed installation. A second set of photographs shall be provided to the project's construction manager.
 - e. As part of the final on-site inspection, the County shall verify with the photographs submitted in the environmental file 03-02-016 that the installation of the specified cabinets described in the site plans and/or conditions of approval are correct.
2. Would the proposal generate potentially significant adverse noise levels (i.e., in excess of the San Diego County Noise Control Regulations)?

Less Than Significant Impact

The applicant must submit noise information regarding the specs of the proposed ground equipment in order to determine whether or not noise levels may be potentially significant.

XI. PUBLIC SERVICES

Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Police protection?

Schools?

Parks?

Other public facilities?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposal is an unsupervised telecommunications facility however, it will be serviced once a month. There would be minimal burden on public services or facilities. Therefore, the proposal would not create a significant adverse effect on or result in the need for new or significantly altered services or facilities.

XII. UTILITIES AND SERVICES

Would the proposal result in a need for potentially significant new distribution systems or supplies, or substantial alterations to the following utilities:

Power or natural gas;
Communication systems;
Water treatment or distribution facilities;
Sewer or septic tanks;
Storm water drainage;
Solid waste disposal;
Water supplies?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposal will not result in the need for new distribution systems or supplies, or create substantial alterations to the existing systems because the existing utility systems listed above are available to serve the site.

XIII. AESTHETICS

1. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse effect on a scenic vista or scenic highway?

Less Than Significant Impact

The Scenic Highway Element of the General Plan designates South Mission Road as a Second Priority Scenic Route. Mission Road is located to the east of the site. The proposed faux Mono Pine is not visible from the heavily traveled South Mission Road. Therefore, the proposal will not have an impact on the scenic value of South Mission Road. Accordingly, there is no potentially significant adverse effect.

2. Would the proposal result in a demonstrable, potentially significant, adverse visual effect that results from landform modification, development on steep slopes, excessive grading (cut/fill slopes), or any other negative aesthetic effect?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project will not require significant alteration of the existing landform for the proposed project. The majority of the project site has an existing slope gradient of less than 15 percent. Therefore, proposal will have no visual impact from landform modification or grading.

3. Does the project comply with the Steep Slope section (Article IV, Section 5) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable

The project proposes a Minor Use Permit which is not subject to the Resource Protection Permit.

4. Would the project produce excessive light, glare, or dark sky impacts?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project design has not proposed any structures or materials that would create a public nuisance or hazard. The project conforms to the San Diego County Light Pollution Code (San Diego County Code Section 59.101). Any future lighting would be regulated by the Code. The proposed project will not generate excessive glare or have excessive reflective surfaces.

XIV. CULTURAL AND PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

1. Would the proposal grade or disturb geologic formations that may contain potentially significant paleontological resources?

Less Than Significant Impact

A review of the paleontological maps provided by the San Diego Museum of Natural History indicates that the project is not located on geological formations that contain significant paleontological resources. The geological formations that underlie the project have a low probability of containing paleontological resources.

2. Does the project comply with the Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Article IV, Section 7) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?

Not Applicable

The Resource Protection Ordinance is not applicable to this project.

3. Would the proposal grade, disturb, or threaten a potentially significant archaeological, historical, or cultural artifact, object, structure, or site which:
 - a. Contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions;
 - b. Has particular quality or uniqueness (such as being the oldest of its type or the best available example of its type);
 - c. Is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person;
 - d. Is listed in, or determined to be eligible to be listed in, the California Register of Historical Resources, National Register of Historic Places, or a National Historic Landmark; or
 - e. Is a marked or ethnohistorically documented religious or sacred shrine, landmark, human burial, rock art display, geoglyph, or other important cultural site?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project has been field inspected by a staff archaeologist or a County certified archaeologist, Gail Wright, who has made the determination that the property contains no artifacts, archaeological features, or buried archaeological deposits

XV. OTHER IMPACTS NOT DETAILED ABOVE

None.

XVI. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

Less Than Significant Impact.

As discussed in Section VIII, Biological Resources, Questions 1., 2., 3., 4., 5., 6. and 7., and Section XIV, Cultural and Paleontological Resources,

Questions 1., 2., and 3., the project will not degrade the quality of the environment and will not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. The project will not cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels and will not threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community. Also, the project would not reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal and will not eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory.

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term, to the disadvantage of long-term, environmental goals?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that no significant unmitigated environmental impacts will result from the project. Thus, all long-term environmental goals have been addressed.

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)

Less Than Significant Impact.

The incremental impacts of the project have not been found to be cumulatively considerable after an evaluation of all potential impacts. After careful review, there is no substantial evidence that any of the incremental impacts of the project are potentially significant. The impacts of the project have therefore not been found to be cumulatively considerable. The potential combined environmental impacts of the project itself have also been considered in reaching a conclusion that the total cumulative effect of such impacts is insignificant.

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantially adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact.

In the completion of this Initial Study, it has been determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly. This conclusion is based on the analysis completed in Sections: I, Land Use and Planning; III, Population and Housing; IV,

Geologic Issues; V, Water Resources; VI, Air Quality; VII, Transportation/Circulation; IX, Hazards; X, Noise; XI, Public Services; XII, Utilities and Services; and XIII, Aesthetics. In totality, these analyses have determined that the project will not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings.

XVII. EARLIER ANALYSIS

Earlier CEQA analyses are used where one or more effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration.

1. Earlier analyses used: None.
2. Impacts adequately addressed in earlier CEQA documents. The following effects from the above checklist that are within the scope of, and were analyzed in, an earlier CEQA document: N/A.
3. Mitigation measures: N/A.

XVIII. REFERENCES USED IN THE COMPLETION OF THE INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

Air in San Diego County, 1996 Annual Report, Air Pollution Control District, San Diego County

Bay Area Air Quality Management District - Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, April 1996

California Environmental Quality Act, CEQA Guidelines 1997

California State Clean Air Act of 1988

County of San Diego General Plan

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation Division
Sections 88.101, 88.102, and 88.103

County of San Diego Code Zoning and Land Use Regulation, Division 7,
Excavation and Grading

County of San Diego Groundwater Ordinance (Chapter 7, Sections 67.701
through 67.750)

County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan (especially Policy 4b, Pages VIII-18 and VIII-19)

County of San Diego Noise Ordinance (Chapter 4, Sections 36.401 through 36.437)

County of San Diego Watershed Protection, Stormwater Management, and Discharge Control Ordinance (WPO) (Ordinance Nos. 9424 and 9426, County Codes §§ 67801 et seq.), February 20, 2002

County of San Diego Zoning Ordinance (Performance Standards, Sections 6300 through 6314, Section 6330-6340)

Dam Safety Act, California Emergency Services Act; Chapter 7 of Division 1 of Title 2 of the Government Code

Eilar Associates, Updated Noise Impact Analysis, 539 Encinitas Boulevard, Suite 206, Encinitas, CA 92024

General Construction Storm Water Permit, State Water Resources Control Board

General Dewatering Permit, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

General Impact Industrial Use Regulations (M54), San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board

Groundwater Quality Objectives, San Diego Regional Water Quality Control Board's Basin Plan

Health and Safety Code (Chapters 6.5 through 6.95), California Codes of Regulations Title 19, 22, and 23, and San Diego County Ordinance (Chapters 8, 9, and 10)

Resource Protection Ordinance of San Diego County, Articles I-VI inclusive, October 10, 1993

San Diego County Soil Survey, San Diego Area, United States Department of Agriculture, December 1973

Special Publication 42, Fault Rupture Hazard Zones in California, Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zones Act, Title 14, Revised 1994

Stormwater Management Plan for Minor Projects, dated received September 9, 2003

U.S. Federal Clean Air Act of 1990

Update of Mineral Land Classification: Aggregate Materials in the Western San Diego County Production-Consumption Region, 1996, Department of Conservation, Divisions of Mines and Geology

ND0304\0303016-ISF;tf